

INSPECTOR GENERAL

76-0762

25 MAR 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

SUBJECT : Inspection Staff Personnel

REFERENCE : Your Memorandum of 19 March 1976

1. I disagree with many of the findings and conclusions of your memorandum, which contains a number of factual errors. Your representatives clearly did not understand the basic concept for organization and work of the Inspection Staff, nor did they attempt to do so. Of more immediate importance, however, is the delay in your findings which creates some problems that cannot be handled readily now.

2. We already have recruited personnel to fill the T/O proposed following approval of the concept for the expanded staff, with the exception of one of the secretarial positions and one of the GS-14 positions. As a result we will have three more GS-15's than in the proposed staffing complement at least until the present staff members rotate back to their present parent components, or retire, in the next three years. We also have three GS-7 secretaries who, on your T/O, would be assigned to GS-6 positions. One aspect of the problem is that even were your proposal acceptable, the duration of the scheduled tours of duty is such that those now holding these positions would have to be provided for under for the remainder of their time on the staff; of these the secretaries must be considered permanent.

STAT

3. One apparent misconception in your paper should be emphasized. This has to do with your characterization of the Rockefeller Commission report and what it said. It did not just "spotlight" the inspection function, but also stated specifically that the function should be manned by "outstanding, experienced officers," that it further said should be "highly qualified personnel." This was envisioned as being for the permanent staffing of the office and not just to get the new program "initiated," as your memorandum would have it.

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

4. As we are already staffed as proposed and approved in principle earlier, we will have to continue this way for the next two and a half to three years. By that time there will be considerable experience with the new program and its requirements, and you may find it useful then to have your representatives take the time to find out something about it.



Donald F. Chamberlain
Inspector General

STAT